REMARKS

The non-final Office Action of, 2005, has been considered by the Applicants. Claims 11, 15, 22-24, and 26 have been amended. Claims 10, 13, and 25 have been cancelled. Claims 11, 12, 15-20, 22-24, 26, and 27 remain pending. Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

Claims 10, 13, 15-16, 26, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Nelson (US 5,087,495). As claims 10 and 13 have been cancelled, their rejection is moot. Applicants traverse the remaining portions of the rejection.

The reference does not disclose all claim limitations. Independent claim 15 has been amended to recite that the compression wheel moves transversely across the seam region (in other words, perpendicular to the direction of travel of the imaging member belt). Support for this claim limitation can be found in Figure 6 and in the specification at page 28, lines 3-21, and page 30, line 20 to page 32, line 7. In combination, these pages describe transverse movement of the compression wheel for the two exemplary embodiments described. In Figures 4-8 of Nelson, the compression wheels do not move transversely; instead, they move parallel to the direction of travel of the transfer sheet assembly. Because the wheel in the instant claims moves in a different direction from that of Nelson, the instant claims are not anticipated. Applicants request withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection based on Nelson.

Claims 11, 12, 17-20, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Nelson. Applicants traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 11 has also been amended to recite that the compression wheel moves transversely across the seam region. In Nelson, the compression wheels move parallel, not transversely. Nelson does not teach or suggest transverse movement of his compression wheels 71 and 72. In fact, Nelson teaches away from transverse movement. He notes that the transfer sheet must be properly aligned with the receiving substrate; col. 3, lines 31-35. If his transfer sheet and receiving substrate were moved transversely, they would not be properly aligned. Nelson is also directed towards transferring material to overlay a xerographic image at a high rate of speed; col.

3, lines 45-48, and col. 6, lines 17-23. If the two wheels were aligned transversely, a high rate of speed would be impossible to achieve. Finally, Nelson mentions that the contact area between the rollers is a line. If the two wheels were aligned transversely, the contact area would be a point, not a line. For these reasons, Nelson does not render the instant claims obvious. Applicants request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection based on Nelson.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, all pending claims (claims 11, 12, 15-20, 22-24, 26, and 27) are in condition for allowance. Additional search and examination is not believed necessary. Withdrawal of the rejections and issuance of a Notice of Allowance is requested.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby authorized to call Richard M. Klein, at telephone number 216-861-5582, Cleveland, OH.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH
& McKEE LLP

Richard M. Klein (Reg. No. 33,000)
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 861-5582

N:\XERZ\200621\2A\GXH0000288V001.DOC